

Colombeau's Algebra of full Generalized Numbers ^{*}

Jorge Aragona ^{**1}, Antonio Ronaldo Gomes Garcia ^{***2}, and Stanley Orlando Juriaans ^{†1}

¹ Universidade de São Paulo, Instituto de Matemática e Estatística

² Universidade do Estado do Rio Grande do Norte, Departamento de Matemática e Estatística
Universidade Federal Rural do Semi-Árido, Departamento de Ciências Ambientais

Let $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ denote the commutative unital ring of Colombeau's full generalized numbers. This ring can be endowed with an ultra-metric in such a way that it becomes a topological ring. There are many interesting question about $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ in the framework of Commutative Algebra and General Topology as well as of the superposition of these two subjects. The purpose of this paper aims to give an initial step toward the study of this ring.

Introduction

In what follows $\mathbb{K}$ will denote either $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$ and $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ will denote the commutative ring of Colombeau's full generalized numbers. Recently, Aragona and Juriaans (see [4]) developed algebraic and topological methods to study the ring of the simplified algebra of Colombeau generalized numbers $\overline{\mathbb{K}}$ (see [4]). Understanding the algebraic and topological properties of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}$ is important because a generalized function can be considered to be an C^∞ function defined on a subset of $\mathbb{K}^n$ as shown in [1].

The purpose of this paper is to give a contribution to the study of the algebraic and topological properties of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. In Section 1 we collect the basic definitions, results and notation that will be used in the throughout the paper and as a rule most of the proofs are omitted. In Section 2 we present our first results most of them being extensions of results of Aragona-Juriaans. In Section 3, we present a more accurate look at the structure of the maximal ideals of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ based on two basic tools. First, a careful analysis of the set of the representatives of elements of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. Second, the introduction of a set $\mathcal{S}_f$ of subsets of the domain $\mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K})$ of the representatives of elements of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. The set $\mathcal{S}_f$ plays the "role" of the set $\mathcal{S}$ in the article of Aragona and Juriaans (see Definition 4.1 in [4]). The family $\{\mathcal{X}_A\}$ ($A \in \mathcal{S}_f$) of elements of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$, where $\mathcal{X}_A$ is the characteristic function of A , is very useful to the study of a number of interesting properties one of them being that the unit group $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f^\times$ is dense. We also derive several characterizations of the units of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ as well as a complete description of the maximal ideals of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. The description of the prime ideals of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ appears to be more complicated than that of the maximal ones. Nevertheless we obtain a first step in this direction. Finally, in Section, 4 based in the work of Aragona, Juriaans, Scarpalezos and Oliveira [5] we study order relations on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$ which is used to continue with the study of the algebraic properties of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. Indeed, we describe completely the minimal primes and show that $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ is not Von Neumann regular.

1 The sharp topology on $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$

In this section we recall some basic definitions and results about $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ with the purpose of fixing the terminology. As a rule, the proofs are be omitted.

^{*} 2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 46F30 Secondary 46T20

Keywords and phrases: Colombeau's algebra, Generalized numbers, Sharp topology, Full, Algebraic structure.

^{**} E-mail: aragona@ime.usp.br,

^{***} E-mail: ronaldogarcia@ufersa.edu.br

[†] E-mail: ostanley@ime.usp.br,

Notation 1.1 *Some notations necessary in this work*

- (a) $I :=]0, 1]$, $\bar{I} := [0, 1]$ e $I_\eta :=]0, \eta[$, $\forall \eta \in I$.
- (b) $A \setminus B := \{a \in A \mid a \notin B\}$.
- (c) $\mathbb{Q}$, denotes the field rational numbers.
- (d) $\mathbb{K}$, denotes the field of real (or complex) numbers, i.e., $\mathbb{R}$ (or $\mathbb{C}$).
- (e) $\mathbb{K}^* := \mathbb{K} \setminus \{0\}$.
- (f) $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Z}$, stands respectively for the set of the natural numbers and the set of integers.
 $\mathbb{N}^* := \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\mathbb{Z}^* := \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$.
- (g) $\mathbb{K}^* := \mathbb{K} \setminus \{0\}$.
- (h) $\mathbb{R}_+ := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x \geq 0\}$ e $\mathbb{R}_+^* := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x > 0\}$.
- (i) $\overline{\mathbb{K}}$, denotes the ring of Colombeau's simplified generalized numbers.
- (j) $\mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{R}) := \{\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}) \mid \int_0^\infty \varphi(x) dx = \frac{1}{2}, \varphi \text{ is even and } \varphi \equiv \text{const. em } V_0\}$, where V_0 is a neighborhood of the origin.
- (l) $\mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}) := \{\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{R}) \mid \int_0^\infty x^{\frac{j}{m}} \varphi(x) dx = 0, \text{ para } 1 \leq j, m \leq q\}$, where $q \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (m) $\Gamma := \{\gamma : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \mid \gamma(n) < \gamma(n+1), \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(n) = \infty\}$ is the set of the strict increasing sequences diverging to infinity when $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition 1.2 Let $\mathcal{E}_f(\mathbb{K})$ be the ring (pointwise operations) of the functions $v : \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$. Let $\mathcal{E}_f^M(\mathbb{K})$ denote the subring of $\mathcal{E}_f(\mathbb{K})$ of those functions v satisfying:

- (M) $\exists p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K}), \exists C = C_\varphi > 0, \exists \eta = \eta_\varphi > 0$ such that

$$|v(\varphi_\varepsilon)| \leq C\varepsilon^{-p}, \forall 0 < \varepsilon < \eta.$$

These are called moderate functions.

Let Γ be as in (m) and define $\mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K})$ the ideal of $\mathcal{E}_f^M(\mathbb{K})$ of those functions v satisfying:

- (N) $\exists p \in \mathbb{N}, \exists \gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $\forall q \geq p$ e $\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{K}), \exists C = C_\varphi > 0, \exists \eta = \eta_\varphi > 0$ such that

$$|v(\varphi_\varepsilon)| \leq C\varepsilon^{\gamma(q)-p}, \forall 0 < \varepsilon < \eta.$$

These are called null functions.

The ring of the Colombeau's full generalized numbers is defined as $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f = \mathcal{E}_f^M(\mathbb{K}) / \mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K})$.

There exists a natural embedding of $\mathbb{K}$ into $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ (induced by the map $v \mapsto (\varphi \mapsto v)$ and so write $\mathbb{K} \subset \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ makes sense. Hence $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ is a unital commutative $\mathbb{K}$ -algebra. The following definition is well known (see [6]).

Definition 1.3 An element $v \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ is associated to zero, $v \approx 0$, if for some (hence for each) representative $(v(\varphi))_\varphi$ of v we have:

$$\exists p \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} v(\varphi_\varepsilon) = 0, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K}).$$

Two elements $v_1, v_2 \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ are associated, $v_1 \approx v_2$, if $v_1 - v_2 \approx 0$. If there exists some $a \in \mathbb{K}$ with $v \approx a$, then a is called associated the number or shadow of v .

We denote by $\text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ the set of units of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ and clearly $\mathbb{K}^*$ is a subgroup of the multiplicative group $\text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$. Another interesting subgroup of $\text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ is $H := \{\hat{\alpha}_r | r \in \mathbb{R}\}$, where $\hat{\alpha}_r(\varphi) := \text{diam}(\text{supp}(\varphi))^r$ or $\hat{\alpha}_r(\varphi) := (i(\varphi))^r$, where i denotes the diameter of $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K})$. In particular, it is easy to see that

$$\hat{\alpha}_r(\varphi_\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^r (i(\varphi))^r. \quad (1)$$

For $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $\hat{\alpha}_r :]0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is defined by $\hat{\alpha}_r(\varepsilon) := \varepsilon^r$. It is convenient to define $\dot{\beta}_r := \dot{\alpha}_{-\log(r)}$. By (1) we have that $\hat{\alpha}_r(\varphi_\varepsilon) = \hat{\alpha}_r(\varepsilon)(i(\varphi))^r$.

We now briefly describe the sharp topology on $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ (see [2]).

Definition 1.4 For a given $x \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ we set

$$A(x) := \{r \in \mathbb{R} | \dot{\alpha}_r x \approx 0\}$$

and define the “valuation” of x by

$$V(x) := \sup(A(x)).$$

The following results are easily deduced.

Lemma 1.5 Let $x \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. Then $r \in A(x)$ if, and only if, there exists $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varepsilon^{-r} x(\varphi_\varepsilon) = 0, \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K}).$$

Proposition 1.6 For $x, y \in \mathcal{E}_f^M(\mathbb{K})$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{K}$, we have:

- (i) $V(\lambda x) = V(x)$ if $\lambda \neq 0$;
- (ii) $V(xy) \geq V(x) + V(y)$;
- (iii) $V(\dot{\alpha}_r x) = r + V(x)$ for each $r \in \mathbb{R}$;
- (iv) $V(x + y) \geq \inf\{V(x), V(y)\}$;
- (v) $V(x) = +\infty \Leftrightarrow x \in \mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K})$;
- (vi) V is constant on each equivalence class modulo $\mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K})$, i.e., $V(x + y) = V(x)$, $\forall x \in \mathcal{E}_f^M(\mathbb{K})$ and $y \in \mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K})$.

It follows that $D : \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f \times \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ defined by

$$D(x, y) := \exp(-V(x - y))$$

is a metric. In fact it is an ultra-metric on $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ invariant under translations.

D determines a uniform structure on $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ called the *sharp uniform structure* on $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ and the topology resulting from D is called the *sharp topology* on $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ and denoted by τ_{sf} .

Notation 1.7 Let $x \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$. In what follows $B_r(x)$ (resp. $B'_r(x)$ and $S_r(x)$) denotes the open D -ball (resp. closed D -ball and D -sphere) with center at x and radius r . In case $x = 0$ we omit it in the notation, writing B_r , B'_r and S_r . For the sake of simplicity we define $\|x\| := D(x, 0)$, $\forall x \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ and the distance between two elements $x, y \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ by $d(x, y) := \|x - y\|$.

The following result is a direct consequence of Proposition 1.6 and of the definition of D .

Corollary 1.8 For given $x, y \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $s \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{K}$ we have:

- (i) $\|x + y\| \leq \max\{\|x\|, \|y\|\}$ and $\|xy\| \leq \|x\|\|y\|$;
- (ii) $\|x\| = 0 \Leftrightarrow x = 0$;
- (iii) $\|ax\| = \|x\|$, if $a \neq 0$;

- (iv) $\|\dot{\alpha}_r x\| = e^{-r}\|x\|$ and $\|\beta_s x\| = s\|x\|$;
- (v) $\|a\| = 1$, if $a \neq 0$;
- (vi) $\|a - b\| = 1 - \delta_{ab}$ (Kronecker δ).

Proposition 1.9 $(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f, \tau_{sf})$ is a complete topological ring.

Proof. It follows from the completeness of algebras $\mathcal{G}(\overline{\Omega})$ and $\mathcal{G}(\Omega)$ (see [3]) and from the fact that $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ is the ring of the constants of such algebras. $\square$

Proposition 1.10 $(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f, \tau_{sf})$ is not:

- (i) a $\mathbb{K}$ -topological vector space;
- (ii) separable;
- (iii) locally compact.

2 Algebraic properties of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$

In this section we study some algebraic properties of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. $\overline{X}$ stand for the topological closure of the set X (except in the notation $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$). We start with the following:

Lemma 2.1

- (i) $x \in B_1$ iff $V(x) > 0$.
- (ii) If $x \in B_1$, then the following statements hold:
 - (a) $x \approx 0$;
 - (b) $D(1, x) = \|1 - x\| \geq 1$. Hence $1 \notin \overline{B}_1$, $B_1 \cap B_1(1) = \emptyset$, $B'_1 \supset \overline{B}_1$ and $B'_1 \neq \overline{B}_1$.

Proposition 2.2 Let $\{a_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be any sequence in $\mathbb{K}$ and let $x \in B_1$. Then the series $\sum_{n \geq 0} a_n x^n$ converges in

$\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. In particular $\sum_{n \geq 0} x^n$ converges and we have $(1 - x) \left(\sum_{n \geq 0} x^n \right) = 1$. Therefore $(1 - x) \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$.

Proof. The proof is standard and left for the reader. $\square$

Corollary 2.3 $\text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f) \subset \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ is open.

Proof. We need to prove that for all $a \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ there exists $r > 0$ such that $B_r(a) \subset \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$. Let $a \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$, defines $r := \|a^{-1}\|^{-1}$ and let $z \in B_r(a)$. Then $\|a^{-1}(z - a)\| \leq \|a^{-1}\| \|z - a\| < r^{-1}r = 1$. Therefore $\|a^{-1}(z - a)\| < 1$ and hence, by Proposition 2.2, we have that $(1 - a^{-1}(a - z)) \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$. Since $z = a(1 - a^{-1}(a - z))$ it follows that $z \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$. $\square$

Theorem 2.4 Let $\mathfrak{I}$ be a proper ideal of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. Then for each $x \in \mathfrak{I}$ we have that $D(1, x) \geq 1$ and $D(1, \mathfrak{I}) = 1$. Hence every maximal ideal of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ is closed and thus it is also a rare set.

Proof. If $x \in \mathfrak{I}$ then $x \notin \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ and so $D(1, x) = \|1 - x\| \geq 1$. If $D(1, x) = \|1 - x\| < 1$ then, from Proposition 2.2, we have that $1 - (1 - x) = x \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$, a contradiction. Since $D(1, 0) = \|1\| = 1$, the first part is proved. If $\mathfrak{m}$ is a maximal ideal of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ then, from the first part, we have that $1 \notin \mathfrak{m}$ and we are done. $\square$

Lemma 2.5

- (i) $0 \in \overline{\text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)}$.
- (ii) For each $x \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$, if $r = -V(x)$, then $y = \dot{\alpha}_r x \in S_1$, i.e., $\|y\| = 1$.

(iii) If $x \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$, then $V(x) + V(x^{-1}) \leq 0$.

Proof. The proof is as in [4]. □

Another results that is analogous to one of [4] is

Proposition 2.6

- (i) $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ does not have proper open ideals.
- (ii) No topological $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ -modules have proper open submodules.
- (iii) If X is a Hausdorff topological $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ -modules then for all $x \in X$, $x \neq 0$, the set

$$\text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f).x := \{\lambda x \mid \lambda \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)\}$$

is not a bounded set. Whence, $\text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ is not a bounded subset of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$.

- (iv) A given $B \subset \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ is bounded iff B is D -bounded.
- (v) The only $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ -topological module which is bounded is $\{0\}$. Whence, the only $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ -topological module which is compact is $\{0\}$

Theorem 2.7 Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be a maximal ideal of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ and $L := \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f/\mathfrak{m}$. Then $\mathbb{K}$ can be identified with a proper subfield of L , i.e., L is a proper field extension of $\mathbb{K}$.

Proof. We follows the proof of [4]. Let $\pi : \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f \rightarrow L := \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f/\mathfrak{m}$ be the canonic application. Then $k := \pi(\mathbb{K}) \simeq \mathbb{K}$. In fact, if $L = k$, then $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f = \mathbb{K} + \mathfrak{m}$. But $\mathbb{K}$ is a discrete subset of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ and hence, from Theorem 2.4 and the Proposition 2.6 (i), it follows immediately that $\mathfrak{m} \cup \mathbb{K}$ is a closed set with empty interior. Thus, there exists $x \in B_1$, such that $x \notin \mathfrak{m} \cup \mathbb{K}$. Write $x = k_x - m_x$, where $k_x \in \mathbb{K}$ and $m_x \in \mathfrak{m}$. Obviously $k_x \neq 0$ and hence $m_x = k_x - x = k_x(1 - k_x^{-1}x)$. Indeed, $(1 - k_x^{-1}x) = k_x^{-1}m_x \in \mathfrak{m}$ and so $(1 - k_x^{-1}x) \in \mathfrak{m}$. Since $\|k_x^{-1}x\| = \|x\| < 1$, it follows that m_x is a unit, a contradiction. □

Lemma 2.8 Let R_1, R_2 be positive real numbers and set $r := \ln(R_1) - \ln(R_2)$. Then $\dot{\alpha}_r.S_{R_1} = S_{R_2}$. In particular, if $x \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f \setminus \{0\}$ and $r = -V(x)$ then $\dot{\alpha}_r x \in S_1$.

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Corollary 1.8 (iv). □

Another easily deducible fact is that $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ has no non-zero nilpotent elements and hence its nil-radical is trivial. Consequently $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ is contained in a product of integral domains.

3 Characteristic functions

In this section we study the group of the units of the ring of Colombeau's full generalized numbers $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$, as well as its prime and maximal ideals. The crucial step in this study is to make a careful analysis of the set of zeros of a representative of an element of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. Using this we study some special type of characteristic functions showing that they are related with the prime and maximal ideals of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. One of the main consequence of this analysis is that the set of the unit group of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ is open and dense in the sharp topology. The new feature here is the density since we have already proved it to be open. The idea behind the proof is closely related to Aragona and Juriaans paper ([4]). However there is a crucial difference.

It is useful for the reader to recall the definition of the sets $\mathcal{S}$ and $P_*(\mathcal{S}_f)$ defined in [4] (Definition 4.1 pg. 2217). We will use this notation in what follows. For $A \subset \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K})$ let A^c be its complement in $\mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K})$ and denote by $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_A$ the characteristic function of A with domain $\mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K})$, i.e.,

$$\hat{\mathcal{X}}_A(\varphi) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{se } \varphi \in A \\ 0, & \text{se } \varphi \notin A, \text{ i.e., } \varphi \in A^c. \end{cases}$$

This is clearly a moderate function. Its class in $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ is denoted by $\mathcal{X}_A$ and still called the characteristic function of $A \subset \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K})$.

Definition 3.1 Define

$$\mathcal{S}_f := \{A \subset \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K}) \mid \forall p \in \mathbb{N}, \exists \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K}) \text{ such that } \{\varepsilon \mid \varphi_\varepsilon \in A\} \in \mathcal{S}\},$$

where $\mathcal{S} := \{S \subset I \mid 0 \in \overline{S} \cap \overline{S^c}\}$.

Proposition 3.2

- (i) $A \in \mathcal{S}_f \Leftrightarrow A^c \in \mathcal{S}_f$.
- (ii) $A \in \mathcal{S}_f \Rightarrow \emptyset \neq A \cap \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K}) \subsetneq \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K}), \forall p \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, we have $A \cap \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K}) \neq \emptyset$ and $A^c \cap \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K}) \neq \emptyset$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. (i) Indeed, if $A \in \mathcal{S}_f$, then for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K})$ such that $\{\varepsilon \mid \varphi_\varepsilon \in A\} \in \mathcal{S}$. Thus, from (Proposition 4.2 item b pg. 2217 of [4]), we have that $\{\varepsilon \mid \varphi_\varepsilon \in A\}^c \in \mathcal{S}$; but $\{\varepsilon \mid \varphi_\varepsilon \in A\}^c = \{\varepsilon \mid \varphi_\varepsilon \notin A\} = \{\varepsilon \mid \varphi_\varepsilon \in A^c\}$ and therefore $\{\varepsilon \mid \varphi_\varepsilon \in A^c\} \in \mathcal{S}$. Hence for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K})$ such that $\{\varepsilon \mid \varphi_\varepsilon \in A^c\} \in \mathcal{S}$ and, therefore, $A^c \in \mathcal{S}_f$. Reciprocally, if $A^c \in \mathcal{S}_f$, then $A = (A^c)^c \in \mathcal{S}_f$.

(ii) If $A \in \mathcal{S}_f$, then for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K})$ such that the set $A_\varepsilon := \{\varepsilon \mid \varphi_\varepsilon \in A\} \in \mathcal{S}$. As $\{\varphi_\varepsilon \mid \varepsilon \in A_\varepsilon\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K})$ and $\{\varphi_\varepsilon \mid \varepsilon \in A_\varepsilon\} \subseteq A$, it follows that $A \cap \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K}) \neq \emptyset$. We now prove that $A \cap \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K}) \subsetneq \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K})$. That it is contained is obvious. Now that $A \cap \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K}) \neq \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K})$ follows from the fact that $\{\varphi_\varepsilon \mid \varepsilon \in A_\varepsilon\} \subset \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K})$ and $\{\varphi_\varepsilon \mid \varepsilon \in A_\varepsilon\} \subset A^c \in \mathcal{S}_f$. This implies that $A^c \cap \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K}) \neq \emptyset$. Hence, $A \cap \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K}) \subsetneq \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K})$. $\square$

We have the following obvious result.

Proposition 3.3 Let $A \in \mathcal{S}_f$. Then $\text{Ann}(\mathcal{X}_A) = \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f \mathcal{X}_{A^c}$ and $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f = \text{Ann}(\mathcal{X}_A) \oplus \text{Ann}(\mathcal{X}_{A^c})$. Moreover, for each prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ we have that either $\mathcal{X}_A$ or $\mathcal{X}_{A^c} = 1 - \mathcal{X}_A$ belongs to $\mathfrak{p}$.

Notation 3.4 In what follows the symbol $P(\mathcal{S}_f)$ denotes the set of all subsets of $\mathcal{S}_f$.

Definition 3.5 We denote by $P_*(\mathcal{S}_f)$ the set of all $\mathcal{F} \in P(\mathcal{S}_f)$ verifying the following conditions:

- (i) For every $A \in \mathcal{S}_f$, either A or A^c belongs to $\mathcal{F}$ but not both.
- (ii) If $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$ then $A \cup B \in \mathcal{F}$.

The second condition says that $\mathcal{F}$ is stable under finite union. The following proposition enumerates some properties of the functions $\mathcal{X}_A$.

Proposition 3.6

- (i) If $A \in \mathcal{S}_f$ then $\mathcal{X}_A \in S_1$.
- (ii) If $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$, $A \neq B$ and $\mathcal{X}_A \neq \mathcal{X}_B$ then $d(\mathcal{X}_A, \mathcal{X}_B) = \|\mathcal{X}_A - \mathcal{X}_B\| = 1$. Hence the topology of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ does not have an enumerable base.
- (iii) If $A \in \mathcal{S}_f$ then $\mathcal{X}_A \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f \setminus \{0, 1\}$ and $\mathcal{X}_A = \mathcal{X}_A^2$.
- (iv) $(1 - \mathcal{X}_A)\mathcal{X}_A = 0$.

Proof. (i) To show that $\|\mathcal{X}_A\| = 1$ observe that $\dot{\alpha}_{-r} \approx 0 \Leftrightarrow r < 0$. (see [2]) Thus, if $r \in A(\mathcal{X}_A)$ (see Definition 1.4), then $\dot{\alpha}_{-r}\mathcal{X}_A \approx 0$ and, therefore, $\dot{\alpha}_{-r} \approx 0$ and so $A(\mathcal{X}_A) =]-\infty, 0[$. Hence $\|\mathcal{X}_A\| = e^{-V(\mathcal{X}_A)} = e^{-\sup(A(\mathcal{X}_A))} = e^0 = 1$.

(ii) Let $r \in A(\mathcal{X}_A - \mathcal{X}_B)$. Then $\dot{\alpha}_{-r}(\mathcal{X}_A - \mathcal{X}_B) \approx 0$. As $\mathcal{X}_A \neq \mathcal{X}_B$ it follows that $\dot{\alpha}_{-r} \approx 0$ and $A(\mathcal{X}_A - \mathcal{X}_B) =]-\infty, 0[$. Hence, $\|\mathcal{X}_A - \mathcal{X}_B\| = e^{-V(\mathcal{X}_A - \mathcal{X}_B)} = e^{-\sup(A(\mathcal{X}_A - \mathcal{X}_B))} = e^0 = 1$.

The (iii) and (iv) are obvious. $\square$

Definition 3.7 For $\mathcal{F} \in P_*(\mathcal{S}_f)$ let $g_f(\mathcal{F}) := \langle \{\mathcal{X}_A \mid A \in \mathcal{F}\} \rangle$ be the ideal of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ generated by the set of the characteristic functions of A with $A \in \mathcal{F}$.

The following is an easy to result.

Lemma 3.8 If $\mathcal{F} \in P_*(\mathcal{S}_f)$ and $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$ then $\mathcal{X}_{A \cap B}, \mathcal{X}_{A \cup B} \in g_f(\mathcal{F})$.

Lemma 3.9 *If $\mathcal{F} \in P_*(\mathcal{S}_f)$ then $g_f(\mathcal{F})$ is a proper ideal of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$, i.e., $g_f(\mathcal{F}) \not\subseteq \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$.*

Proof. Assume that $g_f(\mathcal{F}) = \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. Then there exists $a_i \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ and $A_i \in \mathcal{F}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ such that $1 = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \mathcal{X}_{A_i}$. We define $A := \bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i$. Then $\mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K}) \neq A \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\forall i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ $\mathcal{X}_{A_i} \cdot \mathcal{X}_A = \mathcal{X}_{A_i \cap A} = \mathcal{X}_{A_i}$. Multiplying both members of the former equation by $\mathcal{X}_A$, we obtain $\mathcal{X}_A = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \mathcal{X}_{A_i} \cdot \mathcal{X}_A = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \mathcal{X}_{A_i} = 1$. Hence $(\hat{\mathcal{X}}_A - 1) \in \mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K})$. It follows that $\exists p \in \mathbb{N}$, $\exists \gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $\forall q \geq p$ $\exists \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{K})$ ($\exists C = C_\varphi > 0$, $\exists \eta = \eta_\varphi > 0$) such that $|1 - \hat{\mathcal{X}}_A(\varphi_\varepsilon)| \leq C\varepsilon^{\gamma(q)-p}$, $\forall 0 < \varepsilon < \eta$. But $A \in \mathcal{F} \subset P(\mathcal{S}_f)$ and so, for this φ , $\{\varepsilon | \varphi_\varepsilon \in A\} \in \mathcal{S} \Rightarrow 0 \in \overline{\{\varepsilon | \varphi_\varepsilon \in A\}} \cap \overline{\{\varepsilon | \varphi_\varepsilon \in A^c\}}$, i.e., there exists a sequence $\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converging to zero when $n \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\varphi_{\varepsilon_n} \in A^c$. It now follows that $1 = |1 - \hat{\mathcal{X}}_A(\varphi_{\varepsilon_n})| \leq C(\varepsilon_n)^{\gamma(q)-p}$. As γ is divergent, we can choose $q_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\gamma(q_0) - p > 0$. Thus, we have $1 \leq C(\varepsilon_n)^{\gamma(q_0)-p} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$, a contradiction. Therefore, $g_f(\mathcal{F}) \not\subseteq \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. $\square$

Theorem 3.10 *Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a prime ideal of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. Then there exists a unique $\mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{p} \in P_*(\mathcal{S}_f)$ such that $g_f(\mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{p}) \subset \mathfrak{p}$. In particular, $P_*(\mathcal{S}_f) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that given in [4]. $\square$

Theorem 3.10 associates with each prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ a set $\mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{p} \in P_*(\mathcal{S}_f)$ characterized by the inclusion $g_f(\mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{p}) \subset \mathfrak{p}$.

In what follows $\overline{g_f(\mathcal{F})}$, where $\mathcal{F} \in P_*(\mathcal{S}_f)$, denotes the τ_{sf} -closure of $g_f(\mathcal{F})$ in $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$.

Definition 3.11 *Let $x \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ and $\hat{x}$ one of its representative. We define $Z(\hat{x}) := \{\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K}) | \hat{x}(\varphi) = 0\}$, the set of zeros of the representative $\hat{x}$ of x .*

Lemma 3.12 *Let $x \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f \setminus \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{F} \in P_*(\mathcal{S}_f)$. Then the following statements are equivalents:*

- (i) $x \in g_f(\mathcal{F})$.
- (ii) *There exists $A \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $x\mathcal{X}_A = x$.*

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): If $x \in g_f(\mathcal{F})$, then there exists $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{F}$ and $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ such that $x = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \mathcal{X}_{A_i}$. Definition 3.5 (ii) tells us that $A := \bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i \in \mathcal{F}$ and since $A_i \subset A$, $\forall i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ it follows that $\mathcal{X}_{A_i} \cdot \mathcal{X}_A = \mathcal{X}_{A_i}$. Hence $x\mathcal{X}_A = (\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \mathcal{X}_{A_i}) \mathcal{X}_A = \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i \mathcal{X}_{A_i}) \mathcal{X}_A = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i (\mathcal{X}_{A_i} \mathcal{X}_A) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \mathcal{X}_{A_i} = x$. Therefore, $x\mathcal{X}_A = x$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}$.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i): If $A \in \mathcal{F}$ and (see [2]) $x\mathcal{X}_A = x$, then $x \in g_f(\mathcal{F})$. Therefore there exists $A \in \mathcal{F}$ and $x \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ such that $x = x\mathcal{X}_A$, where $\mathcal{X}_A \in g_f(\mathcal{F})$. $\square$

Theorem 3.13

- (i) $x \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ if and only if $Z(\hat{x}) \notin \mathcal{S}_f$, $\forall$ representative $\hat{x}$ of x .
- (ii) $x \notin \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ if and only if $\exists e \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$, $e^2 = e$ such that $x \cdot e = 0$. In particular, if $x \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f \setminus \{0\}$ and $x \notin \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$, then x is a zero divisor.

Proof. (i) Suppose by contradiction that $x \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ and that $Z(\hat{x}) \in \mathcal{S}_f$ for some representative $\hat{x}$ of x . Then, by Proposition 3.6 (iii), we have that $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{Z(\hat{x})} \notin \{0, 1\}$. Thus $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{Z(\hat{x})} \neq 0$ but $x\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{Z(\hat{x})} = 0$ and hence x is a zero divisor, a contradiction.

To prove the converse it is enough to show (ii).

(ii) We will show that if $x \notin \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$, then x is a zero divisor. In fact let $\hat{x}$ be a representative of x . We consider two cases:

- (a) $Z(\hat{x}) \in \mathcal{S}_f$.
- (b) $Z(\hat{x}) \notin \mathcal{S}_f$.

(a) If $Z(\hat{x}) \in \mathcal{S}_f$ then, by Proposition 3.6 (iii), we have that $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{Z(\hat{x})} \neq 0$ and since $x\mathcal{X}_{Z(\hat{x})} = 0$ we have that x is a zero divisor. (b) If $Z(\hat{x}) \notin \mathcal{S}_f$ define $x^*(\varphi) = \begin{cases} \hat{x}(\varphi), & \text{if } \varphi \notin Z(\hat{x}) \\ 0, & \text{if } \varphi \in Z(\hat{x}) \end{cases}$, i.e., $x^* = \hat{x}\mathcal{X}_{Z(\hat{x})^c}$. Then $x^*(\varphi) \neq 0$ for some $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K})$ and $(x^* - \hat{x}) \in \mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K})$. So we may substitute $\hat{x}$ by x^* and assume that $\hat{x}(\varphi) \neq 0$.

Since $x \notin \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ it follows that $\frac{1}{x} \notin \mathcal{E}_f^M(\mathbb{K})$ and hence, by definition 1.2, $\forall p \in \mathbb{N}$, $\exists \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K})$ such that $\forall C = C_\varphi > 0$, $\forall \eta = \eta_\varphi > 0$, $\exists 0 < \varepsilon_0 < \eta$ such that $|\frac{1}{\hat{x}}(\varphi_{\varepsilon_0})| > C\varepsilon_0^{-p}$. Taking $C = n$, $\eta = \frac{1}{n}$, we have that there exists $0 < \varepsilon_n < \frac{1}{n}$ such that

$$\left| \frac{1}{\hat{x}}(\varphi_{\varepsilon_n}) \right| > n\varepsilon_n^{-p}.$$

For this φ we define the set $A_p(\varphi_p) := \{\varepsilon_n | n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and let $B := \{(\varphi_p)_{\varepsilon_n} | \varepsilon_n \in A_p(\varphi_p)\}$. Then $B \in \mathcal{S}_f$, i.e., $\forall p \in \mathbb{N}$, exists $\varphi_p \in \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbb{K})$ tal que $\{\varepsilon_n | (\varphi_p)_{\varepsilon_n} \in B\} \in \mathcal{S}$. Indeed, it is enough to show that $\{\varepsilon_n | (\varphi_p)_{\varepsilon_n} \in B\} \in \mathcal{S}$. For that is enough to notice that $A_p(\varphi_p) = \{\varepsilon_n | (\varphi_p)_{\varepsilon_n} \in B\}$ and therefore $\emptyset \neq A_p(\varphi_p) \cap I_{\eta=1/2} \neq \emptyset$ because $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} = 0$.

We now show that $\hat{x}\hat{\mathcal{X}}_B \in \mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K})$. Definition 1.2 tells us that we need to prove that $\exists p \in \mathbb{N} \exists \gamma \in \Gamma$ tal que $\forall q \geq p$, $\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{K}) \exists C = C(\varphi) > 0$, $\exists \eta = \eta(\varphi) > 0$ tal que $|\hat{x}\hat{\mathcal{X}}_B(\varphi_\varepsilon)| \leq C\varepsilon^{\gamma(q)-p}$, $\forall 0 < \varepsilon < \eta$. In fact, taking $p = 0$ and $\gamma(q) = q$ we have that $|\hat{x}\hat{\mathcal{X}}_B(\varphi_\varepsilon)| \leq C\varepsilon^q < 1$ for small ε . Therefore, $\hat{x}\hat{\mathcal{X}}_B \in \mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K})$. $\square$

Definition 3.14 For $x \in \mathcal{E}_f^M(\mathbb{K})$ and $a \in \mathbb{N}$ define

$$(i) \ N_a(x) := \{\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K}) | |x(\varphi)| < \dot{\alpha}_a(\varphi)\};$$

$$(ii) \ \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{a,x} := \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{N_a(x)} \text{ e } \mathcal{X}_{a,x} := \mathcal{X}_{N_a(x)}.$$

Lemma 3.15 If $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K})$ then $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_A \in \mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K})$ if and only if $\exists \tau : \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K}) \rightarrow]0, 1]$ such that for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{K})$ we have that $I_{\tau(\varphi)} \subseteq \{\varepsilon | \varphi_\varepsilon \in A^c\}$.

Proof. We have that $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_A \in \mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K})$ if and only if $\exists p \in \mathbb{N}$, $\exists \gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $\forall q \geq p$, $\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{K}) \exists C = C_\varphi > 0$, $\exists \eta = \eta_\varphi > 0$ such that $|\hat{\mathcal{X}}_A(\varphi_\varepsilon)| \leq C\varepsilon^{\gamma(q)-p}$, $\forall 0 < \varepsilon < \eta$. As γ is divergent, one can choose q such that $\gamma(q) - p > 2$. Now choose ε such that $0 < \varepsilon < \tau(\varphi) < \eta = \eta_\varphi$ and $C\varepsilon^{\gamma(q)-p} < 1$. Under these conditions we have that $|\hat{\mathcal{X}}_A(\varphi_\varepsilon)| < 1 \Leftrightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}_A(\varphi_\varepsilon) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \varphi_\varepsilon \in A^c \Leftrightarrow \{\varphi_\varepsilon | \varepsilon < \tau(\varphi)\} \subseteq A^c$, i.e., $\{\varphi_\varepsilon | \varepsilon \in I_{\tau(\varphi)}\} \subseteq A^c$ or equivalently $I_{\tau(\varphi)} \subseteq \{\varepsilon | \varphi_\varepsilon \in A^c\}$. $\square$

Lemma 3.16

$$(i) \ \mathcal{X}_{N_a(x)} = 1, \forall a \in \mathbb{N} \text{ iff } x \in \mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K}).$$

$$(ii) \ \mathcal{X}_{N_a(x)} = 0, \forall a \in \mathbb{N} \text{ iff } x \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f).$$

Proof. (i) Take $p = 0$ and $\gamma : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma(q) = q$. We have that $\mathcal{X}_{N_q(x)} = 1$ if and only if $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{(N_q(x))^c} = 1 - \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{N_q(x)} \in \mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K})$ and, by Lemma 3.15, there exists $\tau : \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K}) \rightarrow]0, 1]$ such that $\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{K}) \ I_{\tau(\varphi)} \subseteq \{\varepsilon | \varphi_\varepsilon \in N_q(x)\}$, i.e., $|x(\varphi_\varepsilon)| < \dot{\alpha}_q(\varphi_\varepsilon) = (i(\varphi))^{q\varepsilon^q}$, $\forall 0 < \varepsilon < \tau(\varphi)$. So if we setting $C = C_\varphi = (i(\varphi))^q > 0$, $\eta = \eta_\varphi = \tau(\varphi) > 0$ we get $|x(\varphi_\varepsilon)| < (i(\varphi))^{q\varepsilon^q} = C\varepsilon^{q\varepsilon^q} < 1$, $\forall 0 < \varepsilon < \eta(\varphi)$.

Item (ii) can be proved in a similar way. $\square$

Proposition 3.17 Let $x \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$, ($x \neq 0$) be a non-unit. Then there exists $a \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $S = N_a(x) \in \mathcal{S}_f$ and $|x\mathcal{X}_S| < \dot{\alpha}_a$.

Proof. In the prove x will stand for a representative. Suppose that $\forall a \in \mathbb{N}$ is we have that $S := N_a(x) \notin \mathcal{S}_f$. Then either $\mathcal{X}_{N_a(x)} \in \mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K})$ or $\mathcal{X}_{(N_a(x))^c} \in \mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K})$. In fact, if $\mathcal{X}_{N_a(x)} \in \mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K})$ then, by Lemma 3.15, there exists $\tau : \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K}) \rightarrow]0, 1]$ such that $\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{K})$ we have that $I_{\tau(\varphi)} \subseteq \{\varepsilon | \varphi_\varepsilon \in (N_a(x))^c\}$. It follows from Definition 3.14 that $|x(\varphi_\varepsilon)| \geq \dot{\alpha}_a(\varphi_\varepsilon) = (i(\varphi))^a\varepsilon^a$, $\forall 0 < \varepsilon < \tau(\varphi)$ and therefore $|\frac{1}{x(\varphi_\varepsilon)}| \leq (i(\varphi))^{-a}\varepsilon^{-a}$, $\forall 0 < \varepsilon < \tau(\varphi)$. This implies that $\frac{1}{x} \in \mathcal{E}_f^M(\mathbb{K})$ and, since $x\frac{1}{x} = 1$, follows that x is a unit,

a contradiction. On the other hand if $\mathcal{X}_{(N_a(x))^c} \in \mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K})$ then, since $\mathcal{X}_{(N_a(x))^c} = 1 - \mathcal{X}_{N_a(x)}$, it follows that $\mathcal{X}_{N_a(x)} = 1$, $\forall a \in \mathbb{N}$ and hence, from Lemma 3.16 (i), it follows that $x \in \mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K})$, a contradiction. It follows that there must exist an $a \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N_a(x) \in \mathcal{S}_f$.

The last affirmation follows immediately of the definition of $\mathcal{S}$. $\square$

The follow result is fundamental in proving many other results. Sometimes we shall refer to it as the Approximation Theorem.

Theorem 3.18 *Let $x \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$, ($x \neq 0$) be a non-unit. Then only one of the following conditions holds:*

(a) *There exists $S \in \mathcal{S}_f$ and $a \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

(i) $x\mathcal{X}_S = 0$;

(ii) $|x\mathcal{X}_{S^c}| \geq \dot{\alpha}_a\mathcal{X}_{S^c}$ (i.e., there exists $\hat{x}$ representative of x such that $|\hat{x}(\varphi)| \geq \hat{\alpha}_a(\varphi)$, $\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K})$).

(b) *There exist sequences $\{a_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $\{S_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{S}_f$ such that*

(i) $S_n \supset S_{n+1}$, $a_n < a_{n+1}$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \infty$;

(ii) $x\mathcal{X}_{S_n} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$;

(iii) $|x\mathcal{X}_{S_n}| < \dot{\alpha}_{a_n}$.

Proof. Suppose that x does not satisfy (a). We will show that condition (b) holds. As $x \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f \setminus \{0\}$ and $x \notin \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ it follows, from Proposition 3.17, that exists $a_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $S_1 := N_{a_1}(x)$, then $S_1 \in \mathcal{S}_f$ and $|x\mathcal{X}_{S_1}| < \dot{\alpha}_{a_1}$. Let $x_2 = x\mathcal{X}_{S_1}$. If $x_2 = 0$, then $x\mathcal{X}_{S_1} = 0$ and so (a) (i) holds. From Definition 3.14 we also have that $|x\mathcal{X}_{S_1^c}| \geq \dot{\alpha}_{a_1}\mathcal{X}_{S_1^c}$, i.e., (a) (ii) holds and hence x it satisfies (a), contrary to our assumption. So we have that $x_2 \neq 0$.

$x_2\mathcal{X}_{S_1^c} = 0$ with $S_1 \in \mathcal{S}_f$ and hence x_2 it is a non-trivial zero divisor and so is a non-unit. This allows us to proceed by induction. For completeness we show how to accomplish the inductive step: There exists $a_{n+1} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $\tilde{S}_{n+1} := N_{a_{n+1}}(x_{n+1})$, then $\tilde{S}_{n+1} \in \mathcal{S}_f$ and $|x_{n+1}\mathcal{X}_{\tilde{S}_{n+1}}| < \dot{\alpha}_{a_{n+1}} \Rightarrow |x\mathcal{X}_{S_n \cap \tilde{S}_{n+1}}| < \dot{\alpha}_{a_{n+1}}$. Let $S_{n+1} := S_n \cap \tilde{S}_{n+1}$. Then $S_{n+1} \subset S_n \in \mathcal{S}_f$ and so $S_{n+1} \in \mathcal{S}_f$ and $|x\mathcal{X}_{S_{n+1}}| < \dot{\alpha}_{a_{n+1}}$. Definition 3.14 tells us that

$$\dot{\alpha}_{a_{n+1}} \leq |x_{n+1}\mathcal{X}_{\tilde{S}_{n+1}^c}| = |x\mathcal{X}_{S_n \cap \tilde{S}_{n+1}^c}| = |x\mathcal{X}_{\tilde{S}_{n+1}^c}|, \quad (2)$$

therefore $\tilde{S}_{n+1}^c \subset S_n$. In fact, if $\varphi \in \tilde{S}_{n+1}^c$, then $\dot{\alpha}_{a_{n+1}}(\varphi) \leq |x_{n+1}(\varphi)| = |x(\varphi)\mathcal{X}_{S_n}(\varphi)|$ and since $\dot{\alpha}_{a_{n+1}} = (i(\varphi))^{a_{n+1}} > 0$ we have that $|x(\varphi)\mathcal{X}_{S_n}(\varphi)| > 0 \Rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{S_n}(\varphi) \neq 0$, i.e., $\mathcal{X}_{S_n}(\varphi) = 1 \Rightarrow \varphi \in S_n$ hence $\tilde{S}_{n+1}^c \subset S_n$ and $S_n \cap \tilde{S}_{n+1}^c = \tilde{S}_{n+1}^c$. Now $\forall \varphi \in \tilde{S}_{n+1}^c \subset S_n$ we have, from 2, that

$$\dot{\alpha}_{a_{n+1}}(\varphi) \leq |x_{n+1}(\varphi)| = |x(\varphi)| < \dot{\alpha}_{a_n}(\varphi).$$

From there, we have that $\dot{\alpha}_{a_{n+1}}(\varphi) < \dot{\alpha}_{a_n}(\varphi)$, $\forall \varphi \in \tilde{S}_{n+1}^c$ which implies that

$$(i(\varphi))^{a_{n+1}} < (i(\varphi))^{a_n}, \quad \forall \varphi \in \tilde{S}_{n+1}^c.$$

Hence $a_n < a_{n+1}$ for some $\varphi \in \tilde{S}_{n+1}^c$ such that $0 < i(\varphi) < 1$. Such $\varphi \in \tilde{S}_{n+1}^c$ it always exists, therefore $\tilde{S}_{n+1}^c \in \mathcal{S}_f$ ¹.

In this way we construct sequences $\{S_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{a_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying conditions (i) and (iii). We now show that condition (ii) also holds: from (iii) it follows that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $|x\mathcal{X}_{S_n}(\varphi)| < \dot{\alpha}_{a_n}(\varphi)$, $\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K})$ and hence $\|x\mathcal{X}_{S_n}\| \leq \|\dot{\alpha}_{a_n}\| = e^{-a_n} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$. $\square$

Theorem 3.19 *$x \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ if and only if there are $r > 0$, $\tau : \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K}) \rightarrow]0, 1]$ such that $|\hat{x}(\varphi_\varepsilon)| \geq \dot{\alpha}_r(\varphi_\varepsilon)$, $\forall 0 < \varepsilon < \tau(\varphi)$, where $\hat{x}$ is a representative of x .*

¹ In fact, it takes $\varphi \in \tilde{S}_{n+1}^c$, then $i(\varphi_\varepsilon) = \varepsilon i(\varphi)$ and $\{\varepsilon | \varphi_\varepsilon \in \tilde{S}_{n+1}^c\} \in \mathcal{S}$, therefore exists ε_0 such that $\varphi_{\varepsilon_0} \in \tilde{S}_{n+1}^c$ and $i(\varphi_{\varepsilon_0}) < 1$, i.e., $\varepsilon_0 i(\varphi) < 1$, pois $i(\varphi_\varepsilon) = \varepsilon i(\varphi) \rightarrow 0$ when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Suppose that $x \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}})$. Then, from Lemma 3.16, we have that $\mathcal{X}_{N_q(\hat{x})} = 0$, $\forall q \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e., $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{N_q(\hat{x})} \in \mathcal{N}_f$. Lemma 3.15 implies that there exists $\tau : \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K}) \rightarrow]0, 1]$ such that $\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{K})$ we have $I_{\tau(\varphi)} \subset \{\varepsilon | \varphi_\varepsilon \in (N_q(\hat{x}))^c\}$. Thus, from Definition 3.14, it follows that $|\hat{x}(\varphi_\varepsilon)| \geq \dot{\alpha}_q(\varphi_\varepsilon)$, $\forall 0 < \varepsilon < \tau(\varphi)$, where $\hat{x}$ is a representative of x . Hence we may take $q = r$.

Conversely, if there exists $r > 0$, $\tau : \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K}) \rightarrow]0, 1]$ such that

$$|\hat{x}(\varphi_\varepsilon)| \geq \dot{\alpha}_r(\varphi_\varepsilon), \forall 0 < \varepsilon < \tau(\varphi),$$

then

$$|\hat{x}(\varphi_\varepsilon)| \geq (i(\varphi))^r \varepsilon^r, \forall 0 < \varepsilon < \tau(\varphi)$$

and hence

$$\left| \frac{1}{\hat{x}(\varphi_\varepsilon)} \right| \leq (i(\varphi))^{-r} \varepsilon^{-r}, \forall 0 < \varepsilon < \tau(\varphi).$$

We assert that $1/\hat{x} \in \mathcal{E}_f^M(\mathbb{K})$: taking $p = r > 0$, $C = C(\varphi) = (i(\varphi))^{-p} > 0$ and $\eta = \eta(\varphi) = \tau(\varphi) > 0$ to get

$$\left| \frac{1}{\hat{x}(\varphi_\varepsilon)} \right| \leq (i(\varphi))^{-r} \varepsilon^{-r} = C \varepsilon^{-p}, \forall 0 < \varepsilon < \tau(\varphi).$$

Therefore $x \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$. □

Lemma 3.20 *Let $x \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$, ($x \neq 0$) be a non-unit. Then there exists $a \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $y := x(1 - \mathcal{X}_{N_a(\hat{x})}) + \mathcal{X}_{N_a(\hat{x})} \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.17, there exists $a \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N_a(\hat{x}) \in \mathcal{S}_f$ hence $\mathcal{X}_{N_a(\hat{x})} \notin \{0, 1\}$. Define $\hat{y} := \hat{x}(1 - \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{N_a(\hat{x})}) + \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{N_a(\hat{x})}$. Then we see easily that the class of $\hat{y}$ defines a unit. □

Theorem 3.21 *Let $x \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$, ($x \neq 0$) be non-unit. Then there exists a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ such that $x \notin \mathfrak{m}$. Hence the Jacobson radical $\text{Rad}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f) = \{0\}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.20, there exists $a \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $y = x(1 - \mathcal{X}_{N_a(\hat{x})}) + \mathcal{X}_{N_a(\hat{x})} \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$. As $\mathcal{X}_{N_a(\hat{x})} \notin \{0, 1\}$, $\mathcal{X}_{N_a(\hat{x})} \notin \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ and $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ is a ring with unit, there exists a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \triangleleft \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ such that $\mathcal{X}_{N_a(\hat{x})} \in \mathfrak{m}$. We shall prove that $x \notin \mathfrak{m}$: if $x \in \mathfrak{m}$, then $x\mathcal{X}_{(N_a(\hat{x}))^c} = x(1 - \mathcal{X}_{N_a(\hat{x})}) \in \mathfrak{m}$ hence $y = x(1 - \mathcal{X}_{N_a(\hat{x})}) + \mathcal{X}_{N_a(\hat{x})} \in \mathfrak{m} \cap \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$, a contradiction. □

We can now state the main result of this section which completely describes the maximal ideals of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ and shows that the unit group is dense and open.

Theorem 3.22

- (1) *Let $\mathfrak{m} \subset \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ be an ideal. Then $\mathfrak{m}$ is maximal if and only if $\mathfrak{m} = \overline{g_f(\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{m}})}$.*
- (2) *$\text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ is an open and dense subset of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$.*

Proof. (1) ($\Rightarrow$) Suppose that $\mathfrak{m}$ is a maximal ideal of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. Then $\mathfrak{m}$ is a prime ideal of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ and from the Theorem of the approach there exists only $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ such that $g_f(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathfrak{m}$. Let $x \in \mathfrak{m} \setminus g_f(\mathcal{F})$. We now construct a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $g_f(\mathcal{F})$ such that $x_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} x$ in $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. For this we show that x satisfies the condition (b) of the Theorem of the Approach. Indeed, if x does not satisfy condition (b) of the Theorem of the approach then, has been that x it satisfies the condition (a) of the Theorem of the approach, i.e., there exists $S \in \mathcal{S}_f$ and $a \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

- (i) $x\mathcal{X}_S = 0$;
- (ii) $|x\mathcal{X}_{S^c}| \geq \dot{\alpha}_a\mathcal{X}_{S^c}$.

One remembers that this S is accurately $N_a(x)$. Suppose that $S \in \mathcal{F}$. Then

$$\mathcal{X}_S \in g_f(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathfrak{m} \Rightarrow \mathcal{X}_S \in \mathfrak{m}.$$

Thus,

$$y := x(1 - \mathcal{X}_S) + \mathcal{X}_S \in \mathfrak{m}$$

which is nonsense. Therefore from Lemma 3.20 y is invertible. Now, assume that $S^c \in \mathcal{F}$. Then

$$\mathcal{X}_{S^c} = (1 - \mathcal{X}_S) \in g_f(\mathcal{F})$$

and from (a) part (i) $x\mathcal{X}_S = 0$ of Theorem of the approach it follows that

$$x\mathcal{X}_{S^c} = x(1 - \mathcal{X}_S) = x \in g_f(\mathcal{F})$$

which is nonsense. Therefore, hypothecally, $x \notin g_f(\mathcal{F})$. Hence, we conclude that x cannot satisfy condition (a) of the Theorem of the Approach and, therefore, x satisfies condition (b) of the Theorem of the Approach, i.e., there exists sequences $\{a_n\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $\{S_n\} \subset \mathcal{S}_f$ such that

(i) $S_n \supset S_{n+1}$, $a_n < a_{n+1}$ and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \infty;$$

(ii) $x\mathcal{X}_{S_n} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$;

(iii) $|x\mathcal{X}_{S_n}| < \dot{\alpha}_{a_n}$

We affirm that $S_n^c \in \mathcal{F}$. Indeed, if this will not be the case, then $S_n \in \mathcal{F}$ and therefore,

$$\mathcal{X}_{S_n} \in g_f(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathfrak{m} \Rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{S_n} \in \mathfrak{m}$$

and once again we would have that

$$y = x(1 - \mathcal{X}_{S_n}) + \mathcal{X}_{S_n} \in \mathfrak{m}$$

which is nonsense. Therefore from Lemma 3.20 $y \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$. Thus, $S_n^c \in \mathcal{F}$ which implies $\mathcal{X}_{S_n^c} \in g_f(\mathcal{F})$. However $\mathcal{X}_{S_n^c} = 1 - \mathcal{X}_{S_n}$, hence

$$x_n = x\mathcal{X}_{S_n^c} = x - x\mathcal{X}_{S_n}$$

is a sequence in $g_f(\mathcal{F})$ such that $x_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} x$, since from (ii) of (b) of the Theorem of the approach we have that $x\mathcal{X}_{S_n} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$. Hence, $\mathfrak{m} = \overline{g_f(\mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{m})}$. ($\Rightarrow$) From Lemma 3.9 $g_f(\mathcal{F})$ is a proper ideal of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ and, therefore, $g_f(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathfrak{m}$ for some maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. More still, for the Theorem of the approach we have that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{m}$ and the conclusion comes immediately from necessary condition.

(2) We know of the Corollary 2.3 that $\text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ it is an open subset of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$, hence, it remains to show that $\text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ is a subset dense of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. That is, all element $x \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ is limit of some sequence of elements of $\text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$. For the Lemma 2.5 (i), we have that $0 \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ is limit of a sequence in $\text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ ². It is enough then to study the case where $x \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f \setminus \{0\}$ and $x \notin \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$, therefore if $x \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ we take the sequence constant. For the Theorem of the da Approach x it satisfies (a) or x it satisfies (b). In each one of the cases we go to construct sequences in $\text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ that they are τ_{sf} -convergent the x . Initially let us assume that x it satisfies (a) and defines

$$x_n := x(1 - \mathcal{X}_S) + \dot{\alpha}_n \mathcal{X}_S.$$

We go to show that $x_n \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ and that $x_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} x$. Indeed, for the item (i) of (a), we have that

$$x_n = x + \dot{\alpha}_n \mathcal{X}_S, \text{ pois } x\mathcal{X}_S = 0.$$

² See the sequence $\{\dot{\alpha}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ that is τ_{sf} -convergent the zero.

we have that

$$x_n(\varphi) = \begin{cases} x(\varphi) + \dot{\alpha}_n(\varphi), & \text{se } \varphi \in S \\ x(\varphi), & \text{se } \varphi \in S^c, \end{cases}$$

$$|x_n(\varphi)| \geq \dot{\alpha}_n(\varphi), \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{V} \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

For the Theorem 3.19, $x_n \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e., $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence in $\text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$. Now, as

$$x_n = x + \dot{\alpha}_n \mathcal{X}_S$$

follows that

$$x_n - x = \dot{\alpha}_n \mathcal{X}_S.$$

Hence for the pelo Corollary 1.8 (iv), we have that

$$\|x_n - x\| = \|\dot{a}_n \mathcal{X}_S\| = e^{-n} \|\mathcal{X}_S\| = e^{-n},$$

i.e.,

$$\|x_n - x\| = e^{-n}$$

and as $e^{-n} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ follows that $\|x_n - x\| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ what it implies $x_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} x$. Finally, let us assume that x satisfies the condition (b) and defines

$$x_n := x(1 - \mathcal{X}_{S_n}) + \dot{a}_{a_n} \mathcal{X}_{S_n}.$$

We go to show that $x_n \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ and that $x_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} x$. Indeed,

$$x_n(\varphi) = \begin{cases} \dot{\alpha}_{a_n}(\varphi), & \text{se } \varphi \in S_n \\ x(\varphi), & \text{se } \varphi \in S_n^c. \end{cases}$$

Recalling that in the demonstration of the Theorem of the approach $S_n = N_{a_n}(x)$, we have that

$$|x_n(\varphi)| \geq \dot{\alpha}_{a_n}(\varphi), \quad \forall \varphi, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

And, one more time, for the Theorem 3.19, come $x_n \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since

$$x_n = x - x\mathcal{X}_{S_n} + \dot{a}_{a_n}\mathcal{X}_{S_n}$$

follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_n - x\| &= \|\dot{a}_{a_n} \mathcal{X}_{S_n} - x \mathcal{X}_{S_n}\| \\ &\leq \|\dot{a}_{a_n} \mathcal{X}_{S_n} + x \mathcal{X}_{S_n}\| \text{ (for the Corollary 1.8 (i), we have that)} \\ &\leq \max\{\|\dot{a}_{a_n} \mathcal{X}_{S_n}\|, \|x \mathcal{X}_{S_n}\|\} \text{ (for the Corollary 1.8 (iv), we have that)} \\ &= \max\{e^{-a_n}, \|x \mathcal{X}_{S_n}\|\}. \end{aligned}$$

But for itens (i) and (ii) of (b), we have that $\max\{e^{-a_n}, \|x\mathcal{X}_{S_n}\|\} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \Rightarrow \|x_n - x\| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ hence $x_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} x$. This sample our assertive one. $\square$

4 Algebraic Properties of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$

In this section we introduce a partial order in $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$ the ring of the Colombeau's full generalized numbers (on $\mathbb{R}$) which we shall prove induces a total order in every residually class field. The base for this section is the works of Aragona, Juriaans, Oliveira and Scarpaléz [5] and Aragona, Fernandez and Juriaans [2] who developed research, mostly related to the ring of Colombeau's simplified generalized numbers $\overline{\mathbb{K}}$ (where $\mathbb{K}$ is $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$). Actually we prove a stronger result which will allow us to prove, in the next sub-section, that $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$ contains minimal prime ideals. Before we go on we define some conventions.

Notation 4.1 If $\mathcal{F} \in P_*(\mathcal{S}_f)$ then $g_{f_r}(\mathcal{F})$ denotes the ideal of $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$ generated by the characteristic functions of elements of $\mathcal{F}$ and $q_f(\mathcal{F})$ the ideal of $\overline{\mathbb{C}}_f$ generated by the same function (see Section 3).

4.1 Relation of the order on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$

The Lemma below from Aragona, Fernandez and Juriaans [2] is the base for the order definition.

Lemma 4.2 *For all $x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$ the following statements are equivalent:*

(i) *Every representative $\hat{x}$ of x satisfies the condition*

$$(*) \quad \left| \begin{array}{l} \exists N \in \mathbb{N} \text{ tal que } \forall b > 0 \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_N(\mathbb{K}) \exists \\ \eta = \eta(b, \varphi) \in I \text{ tal que } \hat{x}(\varphi_\varepsilon) \geq -\varepsilon^b, \forall \varepsilon \in I_\eta. \end{array} \right.$$

(ii) *There exists a representative $\hat{x}$ of x such that $\hat{x}$ satisfying $(*)$.*

(iii) *There exists a representative x_* of x such that $x_*(\varphi) \geq 0, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K})$.*

(iv) *There exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and a representative x_* of x such that $x_*(\varphi) \geq 0, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_N(\mathbb{K})$.*

Proof. See [2]. □

Definition 4.3 *An element $x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$ is said to be non-negative, quasi-positive or q-positive, if it has a representative satisfying one of the conditions of the Lemma 4.2. We shall denote this by $x \geq 0$. We shall also define x to be non-positive, quasi-negative or q-negative if $-x$ is q-positive and we denote this by $x \leq 0$. If $y \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$ is another element then we write $x \leq y$ (resp. $x \geq y$) if $y - x$ (resp. $x - y$) is q-positive.*

Remark 4.4 *This definition is not a total order in $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$. To see this note that*

$$\hat{x}(\varphi) = \hat{\alpha}_1(\varphi) \sin(\hat{\alpha}_{-1}(\varphi)), \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K})$$

gives to an element which is neither q-positive nor q-negative. It does however define a partial order such that the sum and product of q-positive elements are q-positive.

For every $x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$, if $\hat{x}$ is a representative of x , the function $|\hat{x}| : \mathcal{A}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ defined by $|\hat{x}|(\varphi) = |\hat{x}(\varphi)|$ is of course a moderate function and $|x| := \text{cl}[|\hat{x}|]$ is independent of the representative $\hat{x}$ of x . This Colombeau's full generalized number is called the absolute value of x . Hence we have the natural application

$$x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_f \mapsto |x| \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{f+}.$$

Definition 4.5 *Let $x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$. Then $x^+ := \frac{x+|x|}{2}$ and $x^- := \frac{x-|x|}{2}$ are respectively called the q-positive and q-negative parts of x .*

Note that x^+ and x^- depend only on x .

Definition 4.6 *For a given $u \in \mathcal{E}_f^M(\mathbb{K})$ we define the next functions $\theta_u : \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ such that $\theta_u(\varphi) = \exp(-i \text{Arg}(u(\varphi)))$ and $\theta_u^{-1} : \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ such that $\theta_u^{-1}(\varphi) = \exp(i \text{Arg}(u(\varphi)))$, where $\text{Arg}(u(\varphi))$ denote the argument of $u(\varphi) \in \mathbb{K}$, with the convention that $\text{Arg}(0) := 0$.*

In the case $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ the images of θ_u and θ_u^{-1} are contained in $\{-1, 1\}$. It is also clear that these are moderate functions and inverses of each other. Moreover, we have $u(\varphi)\theta_u(\varphi) = |u(\varphi)|, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K})$. Therefore, if we denote for $|u|(\varphi) := |u(\varphi)|, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K})$, we can to write $u\theta_u = |u|$ and, therefore, $|u| \in \mathcal{E}_f^M(\mathbb{R})$.

Definition 4.7 *For a given $u \in \mathcal{E}_f^M(\mathbb{K})$ we defined $\Theta_u = \text{cl}[\theta_u]$ and $\Theta_u^{-1} = \text{cl}[\theta_u^{-1}]$*

Since $\Theta_u \Theta_u^{-1} = 1 = \Theta_u^{-1} \Theta_u$ we have that they are units. Note however that these functions depend on the representative. The following proposition is easily proved.

Proposition 4.8 *Let $x, y \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$. Then:*

- (i) $x = x^+$ iff $x = |x|$ iff x is q-positive.
- (ii) $x = x^-$ iff $x = -|x|$ iff x is q-negative.
- (iii) $(-x)^+ = -(x^-)$ e $(-x)^- = -(x^+)$.
- (iv) $|x| \geq 0 \leq x^+, x^- \leq 0 \leq -x^+, |-x| = |x|$ e $|x| \geq x$.

- (v) $|x + y| \leq |x| + |y|$, $||x| - |y|| \leq |x - y|$ (triangular inequality).
- (vi) If $x \leq y$ and $-x \leq y$, then $|x| \leq y$.
- (vii) $x^+ = x \left(\frac{1+\Theta_{\hat{x}}}{2} \right)$ and $x^- = x \left(\frac{1-\Theta_{\hat{x}}}{2} \right)$.
- (viii) If $A = \{\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K}) | \hat{x}(\varphi) \geq 0\}$ then $x^+ = x\mathcal{X}_A$ and $x^- = x\mathcal{X}_{A^c}$.

Remark 4.9 Note that if $z \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}_f$ then $|z| \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$, $|z| \geq 0$ and so we may apply Proposition 4.8 where possible. In particular, the triangular inequalities hold in this context.

Proposition 4.10 (Convexity of ideals) Let $\mathfrak{J}$ be an ideal of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ and $x, y \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. Then:

- (i) $x \in \mathfrak{J}$ if, and only if, $|x| \in \mathfrak{J}$.
- (ii) If $x \in \mathfrak{J}$ and $|y| \leq |x|$ then $y \in \mathfrak{J}$.
- (iii) If $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ and $0 \leq y \leq x$ then $y \in \mathfrak{J}$.

Proof. (i) If $x \in \mathfrak{J}$, then $|x| = x\Theta_{\hat{x}} \in \mathfrak{J}$. Therefore $\mathfrak{J}$ is an ideal. Reciprocally, if $|x| \in \mathfrak{J}$, then $|x| = x\Theta_{\hat{x}} \in \mathfrak{J}$. Now, since $\Theta_{\hat{x}} \in \text{Inv}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ follows that $x = |x|\Theta_{\hat{x}}^{-1} \in \mathfrak{J}$, i.e., $x \in \mathfrak{J}$.

(ii) If $|y| = |x|$, then from (i), $|x| \in \mathfrak{J}$. Therefore $x \in \mathfrak{J}$ hence $|y| \in \mathfrak{J}$ and from the reciprocal of (i) it follows that $y \in \mathfrak{J}$. Now, if $|y| < |x|$, then $|x| \neq 0$. Therefore if $|x| = 0$, then $|y| < 0$ which is nonsense. Therefore $|y| \geq 0$. Let $u = \frac{|y|}{|x|}$. Then $|y| = u|x| \in \mathfrak{J}$. Therefore from (i) $|x| \in \mathfrak{J}$ ($x \in \mathfrak{J}$) and $\mathfrak{J}$ is a ideal of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. Once again, from the reciprocal one of (i), we have that $y \in \mathfrak{J}$.

(iii) Follows from (ii) and Proposition 4.8. $\square$

Remark 4.11 If $z \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}_f$ then it is clear that we may write $z = x + iy$, with $x, y \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$, where i is the class of the constant function $\sqrt{-1}$. We define $\Re(z) := x$ and $\Im(z) := y$, the real and imaginary part of z , respectively. Clearly, if $\hat{z} = \hat{x} + \sqrt{-1}\hat{y}$ is a representative of z then $\hat{x}$ and $\hat{y}$ are representatives of x and y , respectively. It is also clear that $\overline{\mathbb{C}}_f$ is a $\mathbb{R}$ -module and that the maps $\Re, \Im : \overline{\mathbb{C}}_f \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$ are $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$ -epimorphisms. Hence if $\mathfrak{J} \triangleleft \overline{\mathbb{C}}_f$ is an ideal then its image by these epimorphisms are ideals of $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$ and it is easily seen that they coincide; it will be denoted by $\mathfrak{J}_r$ and called the real part of $\mathfrak{J}$. We have by Proposition 4.10 that $\mathfrak{J}_r \subset \mathfrak{J}$.

Note that the involutions $c : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defines by $c(z) = \bar{z}$ extends to an involution $\overline{\mathbb{C}}_f \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}}_f$ of $\overline{\mathbb{C}}_f$. We shall call this involution conjugation. The following result is clear.

Lemma 4.12 Let $\mathfrak{J} \triangleleft \overline{\mathbb{C}}_f$ be an ideal of $\overline{\mathbb{C}}_f$. Then:

- (i) $\mathfrak{J}_r \subset \mathfrak{J}$.
- (ii) $\mathfrak{J} = \mathfrak{J}_r + i\mathfrak{J}_r$ and $\mathfrak{J}$ is invariant under conjugation.
- (iii) $\mathfrak{J}_r = \mathfrak{J} \cap \overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$.

Corollary 4.13 Let $\mathcal{F} \in P_*(S_f)$. Then:

- (i) $g_{f_r}(\mathcal{F})$ is the real part of $g_f(\mathcal{F})$ (see Definition 3.7).
- (ii) If $z \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}_f$ then $z \in g_f(\mathcal{F})$ if and only if $|z| \in g_{f_r}(\mathcal{F})$.

Lemma 4.14 Let $\mathcal{F} \in P_*(S_f)$ and $x, y \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$. Then the following hold:

- (i) If $(x - y) \in g_{f_r}(\mathcal{F})$ and $x^- \in g_{f_r}(\mathcal{F})$ then $y^- \in g_{f_r}(\mathcal{F})$.
- (ii) The part x^+ or x^- of x belongs to $g_{f_r}(\mathcal{F})$.

Proof. (i) We have from Proposition 4.8 item (v) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^- - y^-\| &= \left\| \frac{x - |x|}{2} - \frac{y - |y|}{2} \right\| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} |x - |x| - y + |y|| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} (|x - y| + ||y| - |x||) \\ &\leq |x - y|, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., $\|x^- - y^-\| \leq |x - y|$. Since $(x - y) \in g_{f_r}(\mathcal{F})$, it follows from Proposition 4.10 item (ii) that $|x^- - y^-| \in g_{f_r}(\mathcal{F})$ and from the reciprocal of 4.10 item (i) we have that $x^- - y^- \in g_{f_r}(\mathcal{F})$ and since $x^- \in g_{f_r}(\mathcal{F})$ it follows that $y^- \in g_{f_r}(\mathcal{F})$.

(ii) We can assume here that x is q -positive and non q -negative hence, x has a representative $\hat{x}$ such that $\theta_{\hat{x}} \notin \{\pm 1\}$ what it means that if $A := \{\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K}) | \theta_{\hat{x}} \equiv 1\}$, then A or A^c belongs in $\mathcal{F}$ and the result follows from Proposition 4.8 item (viii). $\square$

Definition 4.15 Let $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_f / g_{f_r}(\mathcal{F})$ be given. We say that α is non-negative, $\alpha \geq 0$, if α has a representative $a \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$ such that the part negative, a^- , belongs to $\in g_{f_r}(\mathcal{F})$.

Definition 4.15 gives rise to ordering in the traditional way. Lemma 4.14 shows that Definition 4.15 is intrinsic, i.e., it does not depend on the representative. The following lemma is easily shown and should be well known.

Lemma 4.16 Let $(A, \leq)$ be a commutative unitary partially ordered ring and $a, b \in A$. Then:

- (i) $(A, \leq)$ is totally ordered if and only if either $a \geq 0$ or $-a \geq 0$.
- (ii) If $\geq$ is a total order on A , the nil-radical of A , $\mathcal{N}(A)$, is zero, i.e., $\mathcal{N}(A) = 0$ and if $a, b \geq 0 \Rightarrow ab \geq 0$, then A is an integral domain.

We now come to our main result of this sub-section.

Theorem 4.17 Let $\mathcal{F} \in P_*(S_f)$. Then $(\overline{\mathbb{R}}_f / g_{f_r}(\mathcal{F}), \leq)$ is a totally ordered ring.

Proof. The proof is similar that one presented in [5] (See Theorem 3.14 pg-8). $\square$

4.2 Other algebraic properties of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$

We reserve this sub-section to give continuity to the algebraic facts studied in the Section 3 where the maximal ideals of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ were completely described. Now we completely describe the minimal primes and show that $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ is not Von Neumann regular.

Notation 4.18 If A is a commutative unitary ring, we denote by $\mathcal{B}(A)$ the set of idempotents of A . Our first result describes completely the idempotents of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$.

Theorem 4.19 Let $e \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ be a non-trivial idempotent. Then there exists $S \in \mathcal{S}_f$ such that $e = \mathcal{X}_S$. In particular, we have that $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ is a discrete subset of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$.

Proof. Let $\hat{e} = e(\varphi)$ be a representative any of e . Then since $e^2 = e$, it follows that $e(1 - e) = 0$, i.e., $\hat{e}(1 - \hat{e}) \in \mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K})$. Hence there exists $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that for all $q \geq p$ and for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{K})$ there exists $C = C(\varphi) > 0$, $\eta = \eta(\varphi) > 0$ such that

$$|\hat{e}(\varphi_\varepsilon)(1 - \hat{e}(\varphi_\varepsilon))| \leq C\varepsilon^{\gamma(q)-p}, \forall 0 < \varepsilon < \eta. \quad (3)$$

Let $S = (N_a(\hat{e}))^c = \{\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K}) | |e(\varphi)| \geq \alpha_a(\varphi)\}$ and $\hat{u} = \hat{e} - \hat{\mathcal{X}}_S$. Then we will go show that $\hat{u} \in \mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K})$. Indeed, if $\hat{u} = \hat{e} - \hat{\mathcal{X}}_S$, then for all $0 < \varepsilon < \eta$, we have that

$$|\hat{u}(\varphi_\varepsilon)| = \begin{cases} |1 - \hat{e}(\varphi_\varepsilon)|, & \text{se } \varphi_\varepsilon \in S \\ |\hat{e}(\varphi_\varepsilon)|, & \text{se } \varphi_\varepsilon \in S^c. \end{cases}$$

Indeed, if $\varphi_\varepsilon \in S$, then $|\hat{e}(\varphi_\varepsilon)| \geq \dot{\alpha}_a(\varphi_\varepsilon) = (i(\varphi))^a \varepsilon^a$, hence

$$\frac{1}{|\hat{e}(\varphi_\varepsilon)|} \leq (i(\varphi))^{-a} \varepsilon^{-a}, \quad \forall 0 < \varepsilon < \eta, \quad (4)$$

observing that $|\hat{e}(\varphi_\varepsilon)| \neq 0$. Therefore e is a non-trivial idempotent. Thus, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{u}(\varphi_\varepsilon)| &= |1 - \hat{e}(\varphi_\varepsilon)| \\ &= \frac{1}{|\hat{e}(\varphi_\varepsilon)|} |\hat{e}(\varphi_\varepsilon)| |1 - \hat{e}(\varphi_\varepsilon)| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|\hat{e}(\varphi_\varepsilon)|} |\hat{e}(\varphi_\varepsilon)(1 - \hat{e}(\varphi_\varepsilon))| \quad (\text{for (3) and (4), we have that}) \\ &\leq ((i(\varphi))^{-a} \varepsilon^{-a}) (C \varepsilon^{\gamma(q)-p}), \quad \forall 0 < \varepsilon < \eta \\ &= C(i(\varphi))^{-a} \varepsilon^{\gamma(q)-(p+a)}, \quad \forall 0 < \varepsilon < \eta. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$|\hat{u}(\varphi_\varepsilon)| \leq K \varepsilon^{\gamma(q)-P}, \quad \forall 0 < \varepsilon < \eta, \quad (5)$$

where $K = C(i(\varphi))^{-a} > 0$ and $P = p + a$. Now, if $\varphi_\varepsilon \in S^c = N_a(\hat{e})$, $\forall 0 < \varepsilon < \eta$, then

$$|\hat{e}(\varphi_\varepsilon)| < \dot{\alpha}_a(\varphi_\varepsilon) = (i(\varphi))^a \varepsilon^a \Rightarrow |\hat{e}(\varphi_\varepsilon)| < (i(\varphi))^a \varepsilon^a, \quad \forall 0 < \varepsilon < \eta. \quad (6)$$

However, in this case, we have that $|\hat{u}(\varphi_\varepsilon)| = |\hat{e}(\varphi_\varepsilon)|$ and from (6), it follows that

$$|\hat{u}(\varphi_\varepsilon)| \leq (i(\varphi))^a \varepsilon^a, \quad \forall 0 < \varepsilon < \eta. \quad (7)$$

Hence, from (5) and (7) we have that $\hat{u} \in \mathcal{N}_f(\mathbb{K})$ hence, $\hat{e} = \hat{\mathcal{X}}_S$, i.e., $e = \mathcal{X}_S$. In particular, we have that $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f)$ is a discrete subset of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. $\square$

Definition 4.20 A unitary ring is said to be Von Neumann regular if all its principal ideals are generated by an idempotent.

For our purposes the following is sufficient:

Proposition 4.21 Let A be a commutative unitary ring and let $\mathcal{N}(A)$ be its nil radical. Then every prime ideal of A is maximal iff $A/\mathcal{N}(A)$ is Von Neumann regular.

Lemma 4.22 Let $\gamma : \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be defined as follows:

$$\gamma(\varphi) = \begin{cases} +\infty, & \text{if } (i(\varphi))^{-1} \notin \mathbb{N} \\ p, & \text{if } (i(\varphi))^{-1} \in \mathbb{N}, \end{cases}$$

where p is the smallest prime dividing $(i(\varphi))^{-1}$. Let $x \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ such that $\hat{x}(\varphi) = \hat{\alpha}_{\gamma(\varphi)}(\varphi)$ is a representative. Then the principal ideal generated by x is not an idempotent ideal.

Proof. Suppose that $\mathfrak{J} = x\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ is an ideal idempotent. Then from Theorem 4.19 there exists $S \in \mathcal{S}_f$ such that $\mathfrak{J} = \mathcal{X}_S \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. From the definition of γ we have two cases two to analyze:

- (a) $\gamma(S)$ is finite;
- (b) $\gamma(S)$ is infinite.

(a) Let $\gamma(S)$ be finite, $\sigma := \max\{z | z \in \mathbb{R} \cap \gamma(S)\}$ and let us fix a prime number $p > \sigma$. Let also $\varepsilon_n := p^{-n}$. Then $\varepsilon_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ and $\gamma(\varphi_{\varepsilon_n}) = p \notin \gamma(S)$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ hence, $\varphi_{\varepsilon_n} \notin S$, i.e., $\varphi_{\varepsilon_n} \in S^c$. Now,

$$\hat{x}(\varphi_{\varepsilon_n}) = \hat{\alpha}_{\gamma(\varphi_{\varepsilon_n})}(\varphi_{\varepsilon_n}) = \hat{\alpha}_p(\varphi_{\varepsilon_n}) = (i(\varphi))^p \varepsilon_n^p > 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$$

hence $x\mathcal{X}_{S^c} \neq 0$. Suppose that $x \in \mathfrak{J} = \mathcal{X}_S \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. Then $x = y\mathcal{X}_S$ for some $y \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$. From there, we have that $0 = (y\mathcal{X}_S)\mathcal{X}_{S^c} = x\mathcal{X}_{S^c} \neq 0$ which is a contradiction.

(b) Now, if $\gamma(S)$ is infinite, then there exists a sequence $\{\varepsilon_n\} \subset \{\varepsilon | \varphi_\varepsilon \in S\}$ that converges to zero when $n \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\{\gamma(\varphi_{\varepsilon_n})\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ is an increasing and strict divergent sequence. Let us assume that $\mathcal{X}_S = yx$. Then

$$\hat{\mathcal{X}}_S(\varphi_\varepsilon) - \hat{y}(\varphi_\varepsilon)\hat{x}(\varphi_\varepsilon) = 1 - \hat{y}(\varphi_\varepsilon)\hat{x}(\varphi_\varepsilon) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

But since $\{\gamma(\varphi_{\varepsilon_n})\}$ is a divergent increasing sequence it follows easily that y cannot be a moderate function, that is, $y \notin \mathcal{E}_f^M(\mathbb{K})$ which is a contradiction.

Of the two contradictions found in the cases (a) and (b) give the result. $\square$

From the above we can affirm that $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ is not Von regular Neumann according to Definition 4.20.

Theorem 4.23 $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ is not Von Neumann regular. In particular, there exists $\mathcal{F} \in P_*(S_f)$ such that $g_f(\mathcal{F})$ is not closed and $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ has a prime ideal which is not maximal.

Proof. We know from Theorem 3.21 that the nil-radical of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ is null, that is, $\mathcal{N}(\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f) = \{0\}$. Therefore, from Proposition 4.21 and Lemma 4.22 follows that $\overline{\mathbb{K}}_f$ is not Von regular Neumann. $\square$

Theorem 4.24 For all $\mathcal{F} \in P_*(S_f)$, we have $g_f(\mathcal{F})$ is a prime ideal.

Proof. Initially, let us assume that $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$. We need to show that condition (ii) of Lemma 4.16 is verified. Thus, there are $a, b \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$ such that $a^-, b^- \in g_f(\mathcal{F})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (ab)^- &= \frac{1}{2}(ab - |a||b|) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}[(a^+ + a^-)(b^+ + b^-) - (a^+ - a^-)(b^+ - b^-)] \\ &= a^+b^- + a^-b^+. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $(ab)^- \in g_f(\mathcal{F})$. Therefore $a^+b^- + a^-b^+ \in g_f(\mathcal{F})$. This means that the positive cone is invariant for multiplication. Now, let $a \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$ such that $a^2 \in g_f(\mathcal{F})$. From the definition of the ideal $g_f(\mathcal{F})$, we have that there exists $A \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $a^2 = a^2\mathcal{X}_A$. Hence, $a^2\mathcal{X}_{A^c} = 0$ and thus $a\mathcal{X}_{A^c} \in \mathcal{N}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}_f) = 0$. Then, $a = a\mathcal{X}_A + a\mathcal{X}_{A^c} = a\mathcal{X}_A \in g_f(\mathcal{F})$. Thus, we are made in this case. To complete the test let us consider the case where $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$. Let $x, y \in g_f(\mathcal{F})$ such that $xy \in g_f(\mathcal{F})$. Then $|xy| = |x||y| \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_f \cap g_f(\mathcal{F}) = g_{f,r}(\mathcal{F})$. For the first case $|x|$ or $|y|$ belongs to $g_{f,r}(\mathcal{F})$ and from the convexity of ideals it follows the result. $\square$

Corollary 4.25 $\{g_{f,r}(\mathcal{F}) | \mathcal{F} \in P_*(S_f)\}$ is the set of minimal prime ideals of $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_f$ and $\{g_f(\mathcal{F}) | \mathcal{F} \in P_*(S_f)\}$ is the set prime ideals of $\overline{\mathbb{C}}_f$.

acknowledgement This paper is part of the second authors Ph.D. thesis done under supervision of the last author at the University of São Paulo, Brazil.

References

- [1] J. ARAGONA, R. FERNANDEZ, AND S. O. JURIAANS, *Natural topologies on Colombeau algebras*. submitted.
- [2] ———, *The sharp topology on the full Colombeau algebra of generalized functions*, Integral Transforms Spec. Funct., 17 (2006), pp. 165–170.
- [3] J. ARAGONA, A. R. G. GARCIA, AND S. O. JURIAANS, *Generalized solutions of a nonlinear parabolic equation with generalized functions as initial data*. Submitted, 2008.
- [4] J. ARAGONA AND S. O. JURIAANS, *Some structural properties of the topological ring of Colombeau's generalized numbers*, Comm. Algebra, 29 (2001), pp. 2201–2230.
- [5] J. ARAGONA, S. O. JURIAANS, O. R. B. OLIVEIRA, AND D. SCARPALEZOS, *Algebraic and geometric theory of the topological ring of Colombeau's generalized functions*. Submitted.
- [6] M. KUNZIGER, *Lie transformation groups in Colombeau algebras*, PhD thesis, Fakultät der Universität Wien, 1996.